

must express his amazement at his argument. The gentleman had borne testimony to the learning and intelligence of the people of the Eastern Shore and those of Western Maryland. If a President of the United States was to be elected, in the opinion of the gentleman the people were capable of making a selection, even if he came from California. They could be trusted with the election of a Governor coming from any part of the State—coming from the mountains or the valleys—and with the election of judges, but yet the people of Western Maryland could not be entrusted with the discrimination and selection of a judge beyond their own borders. Will he limit the intelligence of the people to a single district? He (Mr. S.) knew of no such doctrine. He held that the people of Western Maryland would inquire into the character of their candidate, and they would soon ascertain his virtues and his infirmities wherever he might reside, just as well as if he came out of their own district. It was for this reason he (Mr. S.) advocated the system of election by general ticket.

One of his friends said he had advocated the district system for the election of the State's agents in the public works. The cases were very different. The judges had to decide questions of law, questions in which there was no local interest, and which were uniform. But in reference to the public works, there was a different and entirely distinct interest—each portion of the State had in them a separate and distinct interest. It was because of this sectional interest, of this divided feeling, he voted to secure the people of the State in their different interests—that the Potomac interest—that the commercial interest of the people of Baltimore—the financial interest of the Eastern Shore, and the agricultural interests of Western Maryland, might all be represented.

Mr. W. C. JOHNSON would make one or two words in reply. He had before spoken of his love for the people; but in saying so, he did not mean to be understood as one who gathered his sentiments entirely from the tone and character of the people. If he happened to differ from the people, he pursued his own course always; and when he went for popular measures, he was not going as the people did frequently, upon the principle of ubiquity, and say that the people of Maryland could know a man upon the principle of clairvoyance, and know if a man from the Eastern Shore could read and write. He, therefore, did not go for the superhuman tricks of the people. They were mere masses of humanity. Their intentions were good. Give them the materials before them, and they would act well. According to the plan proposed, they would have to take things second-handed, and they would have to take a certificate of credit which a caucus would issue, to know whether a man was qualified for a judge or not. He could, he knew, almost disqualify himself to judge well, according to the general ticket system, whom he would vote for as judge. He would have to rely upon the knowledge of others. That being the case, he could not believe that the people, by some intuition, had a knowledge of every man before them. But in the

districts, there was no man who practiced in his county, and presented himself as a candidate for the Supreme Bench, but would be known, from the fact of his having delivered arguments in the county courts. That was the reason he (Mr. J.) went for this plan. He would say one word more: He was not here at the time the question of the Board of Public Works was under discussion, or he would have opposed the appointment of an additional number of officers; for, if there was any one thing more than another improper to have been done by this Convention, it was this. He would take occasion, if the bill should come up again, to offer an amendment, allowing those four officers a *per diem* instead of salaries—which, he thought, would not amount to more than \$100 a year. He had only to say, in conclusion, that he would vote against every amendment pending.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, remarked that it was enough to know that a proposition offered here came from Baltimore, to seal its fate. He would vote for the election of the Judges of the Court of Appeals by general ticket, and he would not do it on party considerations, but because of the intrinsic justice which recommends the thing to us. And, he would not say any thing upon the argument of the gentleman from Frederick county, (Mr. Johnson,) who had spoken of the controlling influence of Baltimore. Now, would that gentleman tell him that the citizens of Allegany county were better acquainted with the merits of a candidate coming from Harford or Baltimore county than the citizens of Worcester would be? And yet, that gentleman had advocated for the classification of the State into four judicial districts, in which Harford and Baltimore and Allegany formed one district, to elect a Judge of the Court of Appeals. The Convention had voted for that classification by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. W. C. JOHNSON. I voted to reconsider only.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city. He would repeat that the Convention voted for it by an overwhelming vote. Now, he would ask, was it possible that the citizens of Harford or Baltimore county could personally know every man in their judicial district who might be presented as a candidate? And yet the only argument used here against electing the Court of Appeals by general ticket, was that the voters could not know the candidate living in a remote quarter of the State.

Mr. W. C. JOHNSON said that he was willing to give Baltimore one Judge, but was unwilling that she should elect Judges for all the rest of the State.

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore city, observed that he had supposed so. He was here for the purpose of showing that according to the classification already made, they were called upon to vote for judicial candidates, in large judicial districts, whom the people could not personally know, any more than if they were to be elected by general ticket. Again: Cecil and Worcester were in the same judicial district, to elect one